

SN. 10/644,595

ATTORNEY DOCKET No. NGBC:007

IN THE DRAWINGS

Applicants submit corrected formal Figs. 15A and 15B for the examiner approval.
Reference number 33 has been removed.

SN. 10/644,595

ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. NGBC:007

REMARKS

Claims 1-17 are now pending in this application for which applicants seek reconsideration.

Amendment

Figs. 15A and 15B have been amended to overcome the Rule 84(p)(5) objection. The specification has been amended to correct a typographical error and to include the reference "V80" shown in Fig. 21.

Claims 1-11 have been amended to improve their form and readability, in particular, by removing superfluous language in the preamble. Further, independent claim 1 has been amended to broaden the location of the camera and the image display unit. Claim 1 further defines that the superimpose indicators is formed on the image for guiding the vehicle to a reference position at which the target parking position is viewable laterally of the vehicle, and that at least one of the superimpose indicators, at the reference position, is superimposed on an image of a vehicle parked adjacent to the target parking position captured by the camera. Claims 10 and 11 have been amended similarly. New claims 13-17 have been added.

No new matter has been introduced.

Allowable Claims

Claim 8 was indicated to be allowable if it is placed in independent form. As this claim has been placed in independent form, it is in condition for allowance.

Art Rejection

Claims 1, 4, 10, and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Abersfelder (USP 5,646,614) in view of Sakiyama (USP 6,567,726). Claims 2, 5, 6, and 7 were rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Abersfelder in view of Sakiyama and Kakinami (USP 6,476,730). Claim 3 was rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Abersfelder in view of Sakiyama, Kakinami, and Shimazaki (USP 6,711,473). Finally, claim 9 was rejected under § 103(a) as unpatentable over Abersfelder in view of Sakiyama and Okamoto (USP

SN. 10/644,595

ATTORNEY DOCKET No. NGBC:007

6,587,760).

Applicants traverse these rejections because none of the applied references would have taught superposing, at the reference position, at least one of the superimpose indicators on the image of a vehicle parked adjacent to the target parking position captured by the camera. This feature is missing in all of the applied references.

Indeed, the main reference, namely Abersfelder, fails to teach superimposing any indicators on the image for guiding the vehicle to a reference position, as correctly assessed by the examiner. The examiner applied Sakiyama, Shimazaki, Kakinami, and Okamoto for the proposition that superimposing indicators on a captured image to assist parking, including parallel parking, would have been obvious. Even if the combination were deemed proper for argument's sake, applicants submit that none of these references would have taught superimposing any indicator on an image of a vehicle parked adjacent to the target position. Moreover, there simply would not have been any motivation for the applied references to superimpose an indicator on a parked vehicle at a reference position. Accordingly, applicants submit that independent claims 1, 10, and 11 clearly distinguish over the applied references.

SN. 10/644,595

ATTORNEY DOCKET No. NGBC:007


Conclusion

Applicants submit that claims 1-17 patentably distinguish over the applied references and are in condition for allowance. Should the examiner have any issues concerning this reply or any other outstanding issues remaining in this application, applicants urge the examiner to contact the undersigned to expedite prosecution.

Respectfully submitted,

ROSSI, KIMMS & McDOWELL LLP

February 3, 2005
Date



Lyle Kimms
Reg. No. 34,079

P.O. BOX 826
Ashburn, VA 20146-0826
703-726-6020 (Phone)
703-726-6024 (fax)